



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,486	02/05/2002	Mariana Nacht	GA0217C	8923
7590	03/17/2004		EXAMINER	
Elizabeth Lassen Genzyme Corporation 15 Pleasant Street Connector Framingham, MA 01701-9322			HUFF, SHEELA JITENDRA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1642	

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/068,486	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NACHT, MARIANA	
	<b>Examiner</b> Sheela J Huff	<b>Art Unit</b> 1642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

After careful review of the provisional application, the Examiner determined that the instant claims only have priority to 8/7/00.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The IDS filed 10/21/02 has been considered and made of record. An initialed copy of the PTO-1449 is enclosed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. In claims 1, 3 and 5, ( on lines 1 or 2) "delivery" should be --delivering--.
- b. in claims 1, 3 and 5 line 2 of each, "on" should be --one--.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims are drawn to methods of modulating angiogenesis and/or endothelial cell proliferation by administering a fragment, biological equivalent or derivative of Claudin-7. Claudin-7 is defined in the specification as being SEQ ID NO. 1 and 2.

While the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:2 is adequately described in the specification as-filed, thereby providing an adequate basis for the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:2; there is insufficient written description as to the identity of a polypeptide being derivatives or biological equivalents of claudin-7 that would still maintain the function of the polypeptide. Consequently, the specification does not provide an adequate written description of derivatives or biological equivalents of claudin-7.

The specification as filed does not provide adequate written description support for derivatives or biological equivalents of claudin-7 . Polypeptides having diverse functions are encompassed by the phrase "derivatives or biological equivalents". Thus a broad genus having potentially highly diverse functions is encompassed by the phrase and conception cannot be achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method. For example, Skolnick et al. (Trends in Biotech., 18(1):34-39, 2000) teach that the skilled artisan is well aware that assigning functional activities for any particular protein or protein family based upon sequence homology is inaccurate, in part because of the multifunctional nature of proteins (e.g., "Abstract" and "Sequence-based approaches to function prediction", page 34). Even in situations where there is some confidence of a similar overall structure between two proteins, only experimental research can confirm the artisan's best guess as to the function of the structurally related protein (see in particular "Abstract" and Box 2). Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention. The sequence itself is required. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016.

Art Unit: 1642

Therefore, only Caludin-7 meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the written description inquiry, whatever is now claimed." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.). Consequently, Applicant was not in possession of the instant claimed invention. See University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co. 43 USPQ2d 1398.

Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

Applicant is invited to point to clear support or specific examples of the claimed invention in the specification as-filed.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In Re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150 (CCPA 1977) and have been adopted by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex Parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986). Among these factors are:

Art Unit: 1642

1. the nature of the invention,
2. the state of the prior art,
3. the predictability or lack thereof in the art,
4. the breath of the claims,
5. the amount of direction or guidance present, and
6. the presence or absence of working examples.

The following is an analysis of these factors in relationship to this application.

Nature of the invention

Applicant discloses and claims the modulation or reduction of angiogenesis and/or endothelial cell proliferation by administering Claudin-7 fragments, biological equivalents or derivatives thereof and the reduction of tumor growth by administering Claudin-7 fragments, biological equivalents or derivatives thereof.

State of the Art

The state of the art does not show that claudin -7, much less fragments, biological equivalents or derivatives thereof, can be used either in vitro or in vivo to modulate angiogenesis and/or endothelial cell proliferation or to reduce tumor growth.

Guidance/ Working Examples

The specification is prophetic in nature. Even though the specification does provide in vitro assay which may be used to validate angiogenic activity or tumorigenic activity, the specification provides no examples of these assays actually identifying claudin -7 fragments, biological equivalents or derivatives thereof that possess the above activities. And even if these assays did identify a compound, there is no assurance that the compound would be active in vivo. The claims are directed to in vivo treatments and such treatments, in and of themselves, are unpredictable because pharmacokinetic factors such as the stability of the peptides in the body, half-life,

Art Unit: 1642

absorption efficiency, binding affinity for target cells, biotransformation, and the rate of clearance from the body are important considerations for the efficacy of the claimed subject matter and yet have not been considered. In the absence of these considerations, there is no assurance (ie. it is unpredictable) that the active compound would be available in effective doses at the target sites and for periods of time sufficient to effect the required cellular or biological responses.

Predictability/breadth of the claims

Applicant's claims encompass a variety of different compounds. As defined on page 13 of the specification, biological equivalents includes, but is not limited to polypeptides with minor variations in aa sequence, synthetic compounds that mimic the active site, conformational variants and compounds/fragments with slight amino acid modifications. With respect to minor variations in the amino acid sequence and fragments with slight amino acid modifications and variants: Since the amino acid sequence of a protein determines its structural and functional properties, predictability of which changes can be tolerated in a protein's amino acid sequence and still retain similar biological activity requires a (1) knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acids in the protein's sequence, if any, are tolerant of modification and which are conserved (i.e., expectantly intolerant to modification), and (2) detailed knowledge of the ways in which the protein's structure relates to its function. However, the problem of predicting protein structure from mere sequence data of a single protein and in turn utilizing predicted structural determinations to ascertain functional aspects of the protein and finally what changes can be tolerated with respect thereto is extremely complex and

Art Unit: 1642

well outside the realm of routine experimentation. While recombinant and mutagenesis techniques are known, it is not routine in the art to screen for multiple substitutions or multiple modifications of other types and the positions within the protein's sequence where amino acid modifications can be made with a reasonable expectation of success in obtaining similar biological activity are limited in any protein. The result of such modifications is unpredictable based on the instant disclosure. One skilled in the art would expect any tolerance to modification shown for a given protein to diminish with each further and additional modification, e.g., multiple substitutions. The sequence of some proteins is highly conserved and one skilled in the art would not expect tolerance to any amino acids modifications in such proteins.

With respect to synthetic compounds which mimic the active, this reads on small organic compounds, small peptide fragments, inorganic compounds etc. Applicant has not provided any data to show where the active site of claudin-7 is. Is the active site linear? Conformational?. In the absence of any guidance as to the structure of the active site, one skilled in the art would undergo undue experimentation to determine which part of the 211 aa protein is the active site and then try to determine compounds that mimic it.

In view of the above, it is the Examiner's position that one skilled in the art could not make and/or use the invention without undue experimentation.



Art Unit: 1642


**Conclusion**

The claims are free from the art of record because the prior art does not enable the use of claudin-7 fragments, derivatives or biological equivalents thereof in the claims methods.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheela J Huff whose telephone number is 571-272-0834. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday 5:30am-11:30am and Fridays 6:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on 571-272-0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Sheela J Huff  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1642

sjh

